



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 29, 2004

Ms. Stephanie Bergeron  
Director  
Environmental Law Division  
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

OR2004-6389

Dear Ms. Bergeron:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 206079.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for information regarding Holcim's Midlothian cement plant. You state that you have provided the requestor with some of the requested information. You claim, however, that some of the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104, 552.107, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.104 states that information is excepted from required public disclosure if release of the information would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. The purpose of this exception is to protect the interests of a governmental body, usually in competitive bidding situations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). This exception protects information from public disclosure if the governmental body demonstrates potential harm to its interests in a particular competitive situation. *See* Open Records Decision No. 463 (1987). Generally, section 552.104 does not except bids from public disclosure after bidding is completed and a contract has been signed. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 541 (1990), 514 (1988), 306 (1982), 184 (1978), 75 (1975).

You assert that the requested information is "currently being evaluated through a competitive bid process which is necessary to award grants." You state that the commission "has not completed its review, evaluation, and selection of the applications necessary for awarding the grants [and] may request additional information prior to completing the competitive

selection process.” Additionally, you state that “[i]t is essential to the competitive process that the proposed information not be disclosed until [the commission] makes its final selection and awards the grant contract.” Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we conclude that you have demonstrated that public release of the information you have marked would cause specific harm to the commission’s interests in a particular competitive bidding situation. Thus, we conclude that the information you have marked may be withheld pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code until such time as a contract has been awarded.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Texas Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein). Upon review of your arguments and the information at issue, we agree that the information you have marked is protected by the attorney-client privilege, and therefore, this information may be withheld under section 552.107(1).

Finally, you argue that the e-mail addresses you have marked are excepted under section 552.137 of the Government Code. This section excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We note that section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee’s work e-mail address, because such an address is not that of the employee as a “member of the public” but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. We also note that section 552.137 does not apply to a business’s general e-mail address or website address. Based on our review of the information at issue, we agree that the e-mail addresses you have marked are excepted from disclosure under section 552.137(a). We have marked some additional e-mail addresses that are also excepted from disclosure under section 552.137(a). Unless the commission has received consent for the release of these marked e-mail addresses, we conclude that you must withhold them pursuant to section 552.137(a) of the Government Code.

In summary, the commission may withhold the information it has marked pursuant to sections 552.104 and 552.107 of the Government Code. The commission must withhold the marked e-mail addresses pursuant to section 552.137 of the Government Code. The commission must release the remaining submitted information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body’s intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body

fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Lauren E. Kleine  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LEK/seg

Ref: ID# 206079

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Wendi Hammond  
Executive Director  
Blue Skies Alliance  
400 North Main Street  
Duncanville, Texas 75116  
(w/o enclosures)